

Current Problems of Anti-Semitism

PROCEEDINGS OF A CONFERENCE

Pam
Conf.
N.Y.C.
1962

jointly sponsored by

Department of Interreligious Cooperation
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
315 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

and

Department of Racial and Cultural Relations
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
475 Riverside Drive
New York 27, N. Y.

National secretaries of Christian social action, church press editors, home missions program staff and state Council of Churches executives representing twelve Protestant denominations and the National Council of Churches attended a conference in New York in October 1962, devoted to intensive studies of the impact of right-wing extremism and the phenomenon of anti-Semitism in America. The conference was jointly sponsored by the *Department of Interreligious Cooperation of the Anti-Defamation League* and the *Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches of Christ*. The denominations represented at the conference were the *American Baptist Convention*, *The Community Church*, the *Disciples of Christ*, the *National Lutheran Council*, the *Methodist Church*, the *African Methodist Episcopal Church*, the *A.M.E. Zion Church*, the *Presbyterian Church in the U.S.*, *The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.*, *The Protestant Episcopal Church*, the *Unitarian Universalist Association*, and the *United Church of Christ*. Featured on the agenda were presentations by noted authorities on right-wing extremism and anti-Semitic prejudice and discrimination.

Pam
Conf.
N.Y.C.
1962

Current Problems of Anti-Semitism

PROCEEDINGS OF A CONFERENCE

October 1962

Mr. Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of ADL, greeted those present in the name of the co-sponsoring agencies and underscored the need for greater communication between the various religious, racial and ethnic groups in our society. The ADL looks forward to the day when no man will need the "right" special religious, racial or ethnic credentials.

Right-wing Extremism

Professor Alan F. Westin of the Department of Public Law and Government, Columbia University, declared that from colonial times until the 1920's, the American tradition was Humanist-Protestant, with the main tension caused by a conflict between Protestantism and Humanism. By the late 1920's the turn-of-the-century immigrants and their second-generation American children had begun to move into significant areas of American economic life. Catholics and Jews began playing a more active role. Later, in the 30's and 40's, American Negroes began to articulate their legitimate right to be consulted as a group. All these minority voices became more demanding of the "establishment." Before the 1930's, America was a "racist democracy, marvelous for citizens but hell for outsiders," a sort of "Athenian democracy." The most significant social change occurred in the period from the

1920's to 1947 when the United States went through a traumatic adjustment—the displacement of the ruling elite. It complicated the checks and balances of local politics. New groups won rights to be considered in the pattern of consensus in American policy-making. 1928 marked the end of a political era—the Republican hold was lost and large urban areas firmly established the two party system.

Professor Westin attributed the skillful organization and potency of today's radical right to the terrible strain of being dispossessed. (This idea is developed by Professor Daniel Bell of Columbia in a new edition of the book, *The New American Right*, published in March 1963 by Doubleday.) Those who have held power lose the power either to control or veto. The sense of being dispossessed is a key element in studying the radical right movement and those who are sympathetic to it, although not in the organized furor. The following groups, conditions, and goals have contributed to right-wing extremism in recent years:

1. *Fundamentalist elements of American Protestantism and American Catholicism*—These elements include leadership and members who are anti-modernist, anti-reform and anti-entrance into international affairs. In the Catholic community, McCarthyism was a high point in a trend—a defensive American Catholicism working to separate itself from the American Protestant-Humanist culture. The decline of McCarthyism marked the end of control by the exclusionists and their predominance in American Catholicism began to wane. American Catholicism began to change in its basic approach and in its hostility to the American establishment. There is growing a majority sentiment which is encouraging a new theory of rapprochement to the establishment and which also gives rise to a dispossessed group. Both fundamentalists, Catholics and Protestants are losing ground, for they show no creative trend. They are backward-looking forces, diminishing in numbers and power but still capable of a great deal of noise and clamor.

2. *Change in the nature of middle class economics and sociology*—White Anglo-Saxon Protestant values of self-reliance, anti-statism, inevitable progress and self-confidence permeated the old middle class. There was a fluid middle class based, nevertheless, on a lower class—"a Negro and white proletariat, with foreign ethnic groups who 'work.'" Today, with a large middle class, there is a dispossessed older middle class with no sense of power (i.e., the small merchant, the small-to-medium farmer, professional man). Today's new middle class is found in the bureaucracy of large business, unions and government—an organi-

ationally focussed middle class. The dispossessed people feel themselves outside of this warm shelter and have no place to express their protest.

3. *An opportunity to press for extreme positions on the part of economic and political ideological groups*—The American managerial community and the top leadership of the corporate community are openly hostile to the radical right. (The Birchites challenge the moderate Republicans and not the Democrats.) There are, however, (1) small or middle-sized manufacturers who feel outside of the world of IBM and General Motors, people who have not accepted the industrial *status quo*. They are a major center for support of Rev. Billy James Hargis, the John Birch Society, and groups of similar orientation; (2) a few rightist corporations closely tied with the defense industries and the “industrial-military complex”; (3) one-man controlled corporations, atypical of corporate America today. Such groups support the radical right for pure ideological reasons. Last year the American establishment closed ranks and effectively froze out the right-wing extremist. There were meetings of clergymen, businessmen and civic leaders which communicated to American society “that establishment groups are not in sympathy with the radical right.”

Right-wing extremist influence reached a peak in the spring of 1961 and by the same season in 1962 it was totally locked out. Professor Westin urged a strategy of information, exposure and counter-action. The dissemination of information must contain, in addition to anti-Communist matters, attacks on racism, anti-Semitism and other American problems.

Discussion of Westin Presentation

In reply to questions and comments by the participants, Professor Westin stated that opportunism is involved in right-wing extremism. There are “hucksters” ready to exploit the situation. The center coalition can be effective in exposing the “money makers.” Some retired generals and admirals are active in the radical right, but high level *active* military personnel are not in evidence. (World communism by-passes the American Communist Party, which has never been trusted by the Kremlin. Through diplomatic and trade missions, espionage agents slip in and are left to their own devices; often they have been ordered not to affiliate in any way with the American Communist Party.) Depending on whom the Republican Party nominates as a Presidential

candidate and their attempts to lure back the disaffected, right-wing extremism will affect the 1964 Presidential campaign. At state and local levels, Professor Westin expects that right-wing extremist candidates will win an occasional school board election, a lieutenant-governorship race and perhaps a few congressional seats. The northeastern states, and New York in particular, have not been too responsive to right-wing activity.

Professor Westin urged continued pinpointed exposure of the wildness, recklessness and irrationality of the right-wing extremist. Up-to-date information should be provided to civic leadership on the latest issues of the radical right. The center coalition should take the initiative and define the agenda of American democratic life, giving attention to significant social problems. Campus right-wing activity is counter-balanced by student involvement in the Peace Corps, SANE and various movements advocating racial justice.

Religious groups have played a key role in rolling back the radical right. The National Council of Churches, individual Protestant denominations, Catholic and Jewish groups have all disseminated a great deal of literature and activated their own people. Trusted leaders have denounced the right-wing extremism and have been willing to make it an issue of morals, something which was not done in the case of McCarthy until his demise, thereby contributing by silence to his success.

Patterns of Discrimination

Mr. Harold Braverman, director of the ADL National Discriminations Department, stated that discrimination against Jews does not have the massive dimensions of the segregation and church-state problems. Jews, generally, do not suffer any visible disabilities due to discrimination. There is a paradox: Jews have never enjoyed as much security as they do in America today, yet discriminatory patterns are still imbedded in American society. Today, no Jew suffers total denial of adequate housing, opportunities for higher education or employment—but there are many cases where the Jewish individual may not obtain particular housing, entrance into the specific school of higher education or special jobs they desire. (A recent instance in housing—Mr. Alfred Bachrach, president of the famous Temple Emanuel in New York City was denied an apartment in a New York cooperative because he is Jewish.) The situation is a great improvement over what prevailed 25 years ago. The Jew lives in a “gilt-edged ghetto,” which means he

may compete with non-Jews in many areas but not all. In some, he may compete but not on equal terms—he must be somewhat superior. The small incorporated community of Bronxville, New York, has never had a Jewish family living there.*

In Grosse Pointe, Michigan, the realtors organized to screen out applicants and hired a detective agency to mark prospective applicants. They adopted a point system to exclude Jews as well as other less acceptable groups (i.e., Poles, Slavs and Southern Europeans). Too many Jews passed their required quota of 85 points and, therefore, a special form was introduced for Jews, allowing them fewer points for each category.

A recent ADL study of seven major life insurance companies found some improvement over the results reported in a survey conducted by Fortune Magazine in 1936 when the magazine noted that there were no Jews in executive positions in life insurance companies. In 1956, ADL found that 5½% of all executives earning \$10,000 or more a year were Jewish. Virtually all of them were in sales functions in district offices. Those on the administrative level were mainly actuaries or physicians. The initial reaction of the life insurance industry to the ADL study was an improvement in their personnel practices concerning Jews.

The medical school situation has improved immensely. ADL has conducted an annual census for the past six years. Today, approximately 20% of medical school students are Jewish. In 1940, less than 10% were of the Jewish faith. Of the six medical schools in New York City, where 40% or more of the total Jewish population of the United States is located, one school has apparently frozen the proportion of Jews. It is one half the proportion in the other schools. A letter has been sent to the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Education requesting that the apparent fixed quota be investigated.

A national survey five years ago indicated that one out of four hotels discriminated against Jews to some extent. Resort hotel discrimi-

* In November 1962, two weeks after Mr. Braverman's presentation, the New York State Commission for Human Rights and the directors of a cooperative apartment house in Bronxville signed an agreement that the State agency hailed as a break in the alleged systematic exclusion of Jews from residence in the Westchester village.

nation today is virtually extinct. One nationally known hotel that continues to discriminate against Jews is The Cloister in Sea Island, Georgia.

In the light of the evidence, Mr. Braverman asked what the Jewish community attitude should be concerning hard core discrimination. Should Jews continue to do something about the Bronxilles or be satisfied with the available housing in White Plains and Rye, New York? Should Jewish graduates of the Harvard School of Business seek other jobs than those available to their non-Jewish colleagues? Should the Law Review editor fret that his classmates have been granted interviews by firms barred to him? Is there any point in worrying about The Cloister? Should ADL have exposed anti-Semitism in a major dental school? Should Jews be grateful for the very large favors won and earned or continue to press for unabridged equality?

ADL's answer is to press on. There must be no yielding, for in acquiescing to any kind of irrational discrimination, the principle of equal opportunity is denied and a rationale for the growth of discrimination is provided. ADL's program is not on the basis of the deprivation of Jews but on the denial of the equal rights of Jews to select and compete. The Yale Law Journal, with an ADL subvention, is conducting a study on the recruiting practices of New York firms. On an *ad hoc* basis, ADL continues to investigate individual cases. The Grosse Pointe incident was instrumental in introducing a Michigan ruling forbidding realtors from discriminating against Jews at the risk of losing their licenses.

Another recent ADL study revealed that 67% of private clubs discriminate on the ground of religion. (Racial discrimination is assumed to be much higher.) Sociologists point out that social discrimination is the wellspring of all other discrimination. The employer who belongs to a club which discriminates against Jews, a sign of their "inferiority," then returns to his office or school. Can he judge applications objectively? A counter-argument in support of social club discrimination is the "right of privacy." Among Jews the debate is quite intense and there is no unanimity in their feelings about discrimination in private clubs. Some do not care and wish to maintain discrimination to "preserve" Judaism—a separatist point of view.

ADL policy on social clubs has evolved over the years. Until six years ago, there was no ADL involvement in the problems of clubs. There was a change in policy with the realization that some clubs

represent power structures of the community and, therefore, membership is vital if a Jew is to enjoy equal economic opportunity. In New York City, the Merchants Club is a sort of "stock exchange" for the textile industry. No Jew is a member. ADL has recently asked the Attorney General of the United States to investigate if barring Jews from entrance is a violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

The ADL National Commission has authorized the professional staff to engage in an educational program on irrational discrimination in private clubs. This would include Jewish clubs barring Christians from entrance and membership. ADL has just published a pamphlet, *Privacy and Prejudice: A Survey of Religious Discrimination in Social Clubs*.

More research is still necessary to determine the relationship between social discrimination and employment, education and housing discrimination. If Jews remain unharassed by serious overt anti-Semitism, ADL will use its resources to retain advances and reach upward to do something about social discrimination, to seek entrance into executive suites . . . to reach the Utopian goal of complete equal opportunities.

Discussion of Braverman Presentation

In discussing Mr. Braverman's presentation, a participant felt that needed strength is dissipated in worrying about such a small thing as resort discrimination. Another participant replied that the "indivisibility of freedom" is involved. Sunday Closing Laws were raised as a problem of discrimination. It was pointed out by Mr. Braverman and others that they are more appropriately viewed as a problem of separation of Church and State.

ADL in some limited situations has supported Negro efforts to combat racial discrimination in resort hotels. Negro civil rights groups in the past, when consulted by ADL and informed of ADL programs for the elimination of religious discrimination, have urged ADL to press forward in their limited program. As more and more Negroes move into the middle class and the upper strata of the middle class, the problem will become more important and acute. At present the immediate bread-and-butter problems of employment and adequate housing are far more pressing in the Negro community.

The Anatomy of Anti-Semitism

Professor Melvin Tumin, Department of Sociology and Anthro-

pology, Princeton University, declared that very little is known in a scientific way about anti-Semitism. There are volumes of speculation and theories, but scientific studies are still in the exploratory phase. There is probably a greater understanding of the dynamics of anti-Negro prejudice and discrimination, despite the fact that anti-Semitism is a more classic form of discrimination.

Because there are considerably fewer Jews than Negroes in America, anti-Semitism is, admittedly, less significant than anti-Negro discrimination when these are measured in terms of the number of people affected. But certain aspects of anti-Semitism give it an importance that transcends consideration of numbers. For one thing, just slightly over 20 years ago, some six million Jews were destroyed because they were Jewish. For another, anti-Semitism is the most persistent, nagging intergroup tension found throughout the world. For a third, in America, the treatment of Jews is a touchstone of the success or failure of the ideal of cultural pluralism. Finally, anti-Semitism is found wherever there are Jews, and often where there are no Jews. Almost always, anti-Semitism has the same face, though varying in particular cultural forms.

In five major countries about which we have information (England, France, Germany, the United States, and Argentina), both the per cent of the population who hold unfavorable stereotypes of Jews and the stereotypes themselves are about the same. Thus, in these five countries, about one-quarter to one-third of the population believe that Jews are "clannish," "greedy," "dishonest," "intelligent," and "good family people." This uniform anti-Jewish orientation is suggestive evidence in support of the theory that people tend to see others as they want to see them, regardless of the objective evidence. For it is highly unlikely that the Jews in these five countries should present an objectively homogeneous picture of this sort. One suspects that the prejudicial picture is a creation of the mind of the prejudiced person. That is, anti-Semitism is located in the anti-Semite, just as anti-Negroism is located in the white person, though occasionally Jews or Negroes may reinforce the prevailing stereotypes.

Children Learn Anti-Semitism from Many Sources

While the sources of anti-Semitic beliefs and feelings are probably diverse, it is likely that most anti-Semitism is acquired by direct learning from others, and more often, by the young child from his parents,

friends, teachers, mass media, and other straightforward channels of communication. Some suggestive evidence in support of this is found in the fact that in the five countries studied, the percentage of the adult population that is anti-Semitic is approximately the same as the percentage of the youth population. Such small differences as exist indicate that the youth population is not quite as anti-Semitic as its elders. Nevertheless, there does seem to be a straightforward transmission belt over the generations along which anti-Semitic notions are communicated without serious interference by any contrary teachings.

Anti-Semitism has special significance in America because its presence represents a threat to the possible success of two crucial social experiments now being conducted in America, namely (1) cultural pluralism, and (2) high quality mass education.

(1) Cultural Pluralism

While cultural pluralism is an absolutely essential goal for any democratic society composed of diverse people, it must be seen as a goal that is impossible of complete fulfillment and yet worth working toward and being guided by. In general, one may not expect all persons ever to be able to live with all others in harmony. In particular, and at the moment, because of the tentativeness of the social arrangements among the diverse segments of the population in America, our society has a fundamental need to devise ways to establish a firm basis of good relations and to avoid direct confrontations of disagreeing groups on their basic differences. Of all forms of cultural pluralism, religious pluralism is probably the most difficult, since each religious group has its own concept of God, its own notion of truth, and its belief in the uniqueness and correctness of its own point of view. In view of these differences, it would be dangerous to call for or get involved in the face-to-face elaboration of these points of view. The reconciliation of these basic disagreements had better wait until the various groups, including especially the religious groups, get to know each other better and feel more confident of each other.

At present, we are doing reasonably well in the movement toward a culturally pluralist society. One can think of four stages of emergent pluralism: (1) understanding, (2) tolerance, (3) acceptance, (4) enjoyment of differences. It is probably true that most Americans are still at the first stage, and from time to time feel threatened by diversity. Yet, it must be understood that differences per se are not the major

problem. For it is evident that we have learned to live with and to enjoy other types of striking differences such as those between persons of different ages and different sexes. It is the cultural definition of the significance: it is the threat, or danger, or the enjoyability of the difference that determines whether we will associate with people who are different or turn away from them in fright and hostility. It is noteworthy that regional differences are no longer nearly as salient in America as they used to be and that nationality differences and loyalties are also waning in their significance. Similarly, political differences are objectively very small and do not become seriously problematic except on such ritual occasions as national elections.

Three sets of differences do present themselves, however, as very difficult to reconcile within the American framework at the moment. These are differences between racial-ethnic groups, class groups, and religio-ethnic groups. All three have in common the fact that a good deal of emotion is invested in being a member of any one of these groupings and that a good deal of status striving complicates social relations among members of different segments. Strong stereotypes exist that serve to divide people from each other. Considerable fear exists that one will lose face and status by associating with certain undervalued groups.

These three sets of differences are unlike each other in the amount of fear that they generate and the extent to which they are viewed as reducible or irreducible differences. They also differ in the extent to which the various protagonists feel that their positions and points of view are sanctioned by supernatural forces. Anti-Semitism, for instance, is supported to some considerable degree by a belief that there are supernatural sanctions for viewing Jews with distrust and hostility. Moreover, anti-Semitism keeps receiving added support by the curious line of reasoning that tends to locate the sources of anti-Semitism in Jewish behavior. There is a feeling that since anti-Semitism is so widespread, there "must" be some good reason for it.

The general stereotypes about Jews are matched in the United States by specific stereotypes which make Jews out to be a dangerously powerful group. Thus, it is often claimed that Jews have power seriously disproportionate to their numbers in the society. In fact, in any show-down, it would be evident that the Jews have little real power. Yet, the anti-Semite continues to view the Jews as all-powerful and thus to

reinforce his hostilities on the basis of the concomittant fears that he feels.

In view of the objective powerlessness of Jews, it has become quite evident that the only legitimate channel through which Jews can achieve any security and feel relatively free from danger of attack is through the strengthening of the basic democratic institutions that protect all minorities, including Jews. It may, therefore, be said that Jews have the deepest vested interest in enlarging the scope and deepening the intensity of commitment of everyone to a democratic society.

Among anti-Semites it is also a fairly common belief that Jews are disproportionately wealthy relative to their numbers, and disproportionately well-educated. While it is true that the Jewish community is relatively very well situated, on the average, by ordinary measures of socio-economic well being, and while it is also true that the average educational achievement of the younger generations of Jews is significantly above the national average, it must also be remembered that compared to the total bulk of wealth in the country and the total number of well-educated people, the Jewish economic and educational achievements are relatively inconsequential. Nevertheless, the typical anti-Semite focuses on the relative well-being of the Jew and tends, falsely, to equate this relative well-being with absolute control of economic and educational resources.

(2) High Quality Mass Education

The Jewish population is an example of the benefits that can accrue to a group in a relatively short time in an open society that makes it possible for one generation to move considerably beyond the older generation by means of securing the education necessary for better jobs and income. Theoretically, the history of Jewish mobility could be the history of the mobility of any other group. Also, assuming no major changes on the American scene, Jews are likely, in years to come, to be still wealthier, more educated, and more concentrated in upper class occupations.

The new social position of the Jew has changed the locus of anti-Semitism in a dramatic way. Whereas two to three generations ago, most anti-Semitic prejudice was incurred by Jews among their fellow members in the working class and lower middle class, today it is in the middle and upper classes that Jews experience the unfavorable stereo-

types and actual discriminations. This is why the problems that are most salient for the Jewish community are those of discrimination in universities, in the professions, in the upper reaches of business, and in such social facilities as country clubs and luxury hotels. While a good deal of anti-Semitic prejudice still seems to be present in the working class and lower middle classes, these less well-to-do segments have little opportunity to discriminate against Jews, since Jews are not competing with them for residence or for jobs or for positions in the lower reaches of the educational ladder. Thus, the general notion that prejudice and discrimination are lessening as persons secure more education has to be qualified for the Jewish case by virtue of their very special concentration in the more educated groups of the United States.

There are special problems here, as well, in the relationship between prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice refers to beliefs and sentiments and ideas; discrimination refers to action. It is unquestionably true that anti-Semitic discrimination has lessened over the years. But it is probably true too that anti-Semitic prejudice has not decreased and may, indeed, have increased. For, with fewer approved channels for the open expression of anti-Semitism, one may reasonably expect that anti-Semites may come to feel their anti-Semitic prejudices more intensely. Nevertheless, it is crucial to reduce and, if possible, eliminate any open manifestations in the form of discrimination since, when these exist, they embolden the more timid anti-Semites, awaken and invigorate the great amount of latent anti-Semitism that exists, and give normative sanctions to anti-Semitism as a legitimate form of social behavior.

The tenacity and ubiquity of anti-Semitism are illustrated by the fact that several research studies have shown that one doesn't have to have Jews in order to have anti-Semitism. Thus, for instance, while in England, France, and Germany less than one-half the population ever had met or known a Jew, over 90 per cent of the populations of each of these countries were able to cite with assurance certain unfavorable attributes of Jews. It is facts like these which testify to the existence of a general cultural pattern of anti-Semitism in the Western European framework and which cause one to raise the question as to what point there is, if any, of teaching children anti-Semitic notions if there are few or no Jews around.

For many years, certain portions of the Jewish community have felt that they could avoid the brunt of anti-Semitism by attempting to alter their behavior and appearance to conform with what they felt their

relatively unfriendly neighbors wanted them to look like and be like. But it has been the repeated experience of the Jewish community that accommodating to anti-Semitic opinions and demands has had no benign influence whatsoever so far as reduction of anti-Semitism is concerned. In view of this fact, it is obvious that the Jew has no alternative but to do what he thinks is right, to be the way he feels he must be, and to take his chances.

It must also be understood that significant portions of the Jewish community feel that they wish to remain differentially identifiable as Jews without, however, being treated as anything but first-class citizens. Part of the new spirit of open self-identification as Jews is due to the experiences in Nazi Germany. After surviving that experience many Jews feel challenged to assert their identity more openly than ever before, and more than ever before, Jews are insisting on the right of a quasi-separate cultural existence within the framework of common political, economic, and social rights and liberties.

Both the more remote and recent historical experiences of Jews have developed or intensified within the Jewish community a widespread sense of distrust of many non-Jews. Their experience in Germany, for instance, has led them to be hesitant about expecting any permanence of good relations with non-Jewish neighbors, in view of the rapidity and sweep with which formerly friendly relationships with the Germans, for example, were turned into bitterly destructive experiences.

Discussion of Tumin Presentation

In reply to a question concerning anti-Semitic behavior of youth, Professor Tumin suggested that it might grow out of fear over the fulfillment of parental expectations. If fear of parental control is absent, it may reflect the desire to shame them. The Jews provide an answer to a need to degrade someone. Who is available in the area is an important factor and the Jew has been available for centuries. There is a tendency to disagree with parents in one's hates.

Dr. J. Oscar Lee of the National Council of Churches presented an approach to interreligious and intergroup relations which recognizes the many areas of tension. In some of these areas we *agree*, in others we *agree to disagree* and in still others we simply *disagree*. Professor Tumin supported this view of intergroup relations and suggested the need to move things into the "agree to disagree" area with less hostility. In

pursuing the problem of differences and the current efforts for unity and union (especially within Christianity), Professor Tumin raised the question of the threat to "institutional divisions" that must permeate discussion. It was pointed out that with the current trend toward union of denominations and the ecumenical movement itself, there has been an increased consciousness of the history of other denominations. And most important, unity is more readily accessible than union. The latter involves problems of syncretism, the uncritical acceptance of divergent beliefs or principles for the sake of a common union.

Professor Tumin recalled the history of Christian evangelistic efforts with Jews and requested information about current practices and approaches. Dr. Lee described contemporary evangelism as more and more operating in a context of cultural pluralism. The evangelist witnesses to what he believes and the other person can take it or leave it. There must be a freedom of inquiry and also freedom to reject the results of the inquiry. Evangelism must be within the setting of the acceptance of the reality of cultural pluralism in counterdistinction to the missionary programs of the 19th century. Professor Tumin asked how Christians face the Jewish denial of Jesus as the Christ and also the general Jewish lack of traditional faith. Dr. Lee saw this, too, within the cultural context of pluralism in which he agrees to disagree while maintaining respect for these differences. He felt there is a greater cleavage between secularists and religionists. Jewish and Christian religionists can communicate with each other more easily than they can with secularist members of their own culture and ethnic groups. Many participants agreed with this statement that outside of the domain of religious beliefs and theology, the highest social value is cultural pluralism. Within that context each person has a right and a need to express his particularism in the free forum of ideas.

Programmatic Approaches to Political Extremism and Social Discrimination: A Panel Discussion

Miss Eleanor French, director of the United Church Women's Christian Social Relations Program, declared that the facts presented concerning anti-Semitism are intolerable and Christians must respond with a sense of appalling guilt and responsibility. The church must provide the contravening teaching that is lacking in the culture which transmits anti-Semitism from parent to child to friend and teacher. She urged wider dissemination of information to church leadership in all areas

of Christian work and life. Pilot projects in cooperation with Jewish groups should be conducted, especially in large urban areas where Jews are most concentrated. Advantage should be taken of existing projects. The United Church Women are conducting a three-year program "Assignment Race" for the elimination of racial prejudice in church councils. This year it will be beamed to the local community. "Assignment Race" affords an opportunity to relate racial prejudice to anti-Semitism and Jewish groups. Similarly, the January 1963 Conference on Religion and Race, commemorating the Centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation should be considered. More contact experiences between Christians and Jews on the local level are essential. Miss French endorsed Professor Westin's suggestions for keeping church members informed: (1) Pinpointing radical right activities in local areas. (2) Putting the phenomenon in its historical context. (3) Keeping leadership abreast of current activities. The next task is to defend and secure civil liberties and to move beyond containment.

Reverend John Wilson, executive Secretary of the Ohio Council of Churches, scored the wrong of acquiescence to anti-Semitic manifestations and called for greater sensitivity to the subtler forms of the problem. Anti-Semitism is a malady within the person who hates. He felt that intergroup relations are better than Professor Tumin described. There are more people at the stage of "enjoying differences." He advocated expanding the movement for unity to include Jews. At a faith and order conference in Ohio, the following thesis was developed: Jews and Christians are inseparably part of the "One people of God." There is one Israel into which we are called. Some find it in Jesus of Nazareth, others in the Prophets. It should be a wider circle including all people by whatever name they call God. In the quest for unity, there is no need to fear syncretism, the unconsidered blending of diverse beliefs for the sake of union. The Ohio Christian Youth Movement has a program of youth witness and evangelism. In evaluating their own youth workshop in which a non-Christian played a significant role, the youngsters did not feel themselves less Christian because they had been working with the non-Christian. It was not syncretism but listening, understanding. In Ohio there is an annual Institute of Human Relations, co-sponsored by the Ohio Council of Churches, ADL and the Catholic Interracial Council, held at Ohio State University each summer. Other such programs are necessary. More contact between Christian educators and ADL should be pursued to avoid prejudices entering into church-school curricula. More discussion of the use

of the mass media is necessary to develop the pluralistic culture as an enriching experience.

Discussion of Panel Presentations

Discussion focused on the endemic nature of anti-Semitism. The recent Bernhard Olson study of ethnocentrism in Protestant religious school curricula demonstrated how, within the program of the church itself, anti-Semitism creeps in. In the light of Professor Tumin's presentation on the phenomenon of anti-Semitism, the participants asked what attacks should be made on the problem. What kind of information should be disseminated about Jews and prejudice? It was felt that more continued rather than casual contacts between Christians and Jews are necessary. Some believed that specific programs focused on the phenomenon of anti-Semitism are necessary. There is insufficient use of the already existing audio-visual materials and publications by the mass media. Personal contact with different religious institutions are mere sentiment if the frontal attack on the problem is not primary. Attention must be given to the members of the total community who are outside Christian and Jewish organized life and their special needs for programs and activities on anti-Semitism.

The surprised reaction of the participants to the facts and analyses presented at the consultation emphasized the need to bring this data and information to the broader church public. Attention was drawn to issues like the Supreme Court decision on the Regents' Prayer which is seen as a Jewish-Christian issue. The Jewish community is not a monolithic one and Jewish views on any issue vary. There is a tendency to identify such issues as week-day religious education and Sunday closing laws as Jewish. It was suggested that the public be informed of the variety of opinions among Jews.

A Colloquy on Trends in Interreligious Relations

The denominational representatives joined Rabbi Solomon S. Bernards, director of ADL's Department of Interreligious Cooperation, and Dr. J. Oscar Lee, director of the National Council of Churches' Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, in a colloquy on contemporary trends in Jewish-Christian relations. It was suggested that, in the light of the endemic nature of anti-Semitism and its direct transmission by parents and teachers, training programs with Sunday-school teachers and directors of Christian education on the phenomenon of anti-Semitism be

Direct - Gift - A.M.

pursued, especially on local levels. It was noted that the mass media, an impersonal communicator, at times acts as a corrective to the personal communicators. National magazines reach the grass roots communities even in areas where local mass media may be perpetuating prejudice. Similarly, church periodicals can play such a role. Sustained rather than casual contacts and common experiences between Christian and Jewish laymen are imperative. Concern was expressed over the unchurched and the larger community not reached by the churches. It was pointed out that religious education is so varied and localized, that it is difficult to quantify where and what is being taught. It was suggested that a "Tumin-type presentation" on anti-Semitism be made to the annual Church Writers Conference held in Ohio. Religion can play a unique role in lifting up to public view the basic immorality of anti-Semitism and prejudice.

The participants directed their discussion to exploring ways and means of preparing the public for the forthcoming Supreme Court decision which could declare Bible-reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools unconstitutional.* In an effort to avoid the immediate emotional response which followed the Regents' Prayer decision, it was suggested that local tri-faith leadership speak on the issue and participate in a cooperative endeavor when such situations arise. This must be predicated on sufficient previous experiences, knowledge and mutual trust which point up the need to establish areas of agreement, agreement to disagree and simple disagreement. Issues like the Supreme Court decisions must be assessed on their merits. On the national level today these assessments and cooperative endeavors take less time than in past years. The merits of a position must be on the basis of the cultural pluralism inherent in American society. Some participants questioned the good intentions of those who try to avoid conflict when it is implicit in the issue. The conflict should be treated constructively. Bigotry thus emerges rather than remaining a whispered theme and it can better be contended with. There was some attempt to explore appropriate themes for articles and publications designed to prepare a community for such a Supreme Court decision. The joint sponsors, the Department of Interreligious Cooperation of the ADL and the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches, were urged to foster similar consultations on local and regional levels.

* On June 24, 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a majority decision which ruled such schoolroom exercises to be unconstitutional.

